

Miami Dade County

Stephen P. Clark Government Center
111 N.W. 1st Street
Miami, Fl. 33128



LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS

Tuesday September 21, 2004

9:00 AM

Commission Chambers

Board of County Commissioners

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION APPROVING CHANGE ORDER NUMBER THREE AND FINAL EXTENDING THE CONTRACT TIME AND INCREASING THE CONTRACT AMOUNT WITH ZURQUI CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, INC. FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE COUNTRY CLUB OF MIAMI, STORMWATER MITIGATION & IRRIGATION SYSTEM REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Park & Recreation Department

I. SUMMARY

This is Retroactive Change Order Number Three and Final to the Country Club of Miami Stormwater Mitigation & Irrigation System Replacement, Project Number 99054. The Change Order was a result of a required electrical upgrade required by FP&L after the project had been started.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

	Amount	Total	Expected Date of Completion
Original Contract August 13, 2001	\$6,154,948	\$6,154,948	August 8, 2003
Change Order 1	No change	\$6,154,948	November 28, 2003
Change Order 2	+\$2,025,000	\$8,179,948	November 28, 2003
Change Order 3	+\$56,392.90	\$8,236,340.90	June 10, 2004

This project is currently 33.8% higher than originally contracted and 55% higher than the original cost estimate. The project is 307 days behind the original expected date of completion.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

N/A

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Change order three has a cost of	\$83,964.07
Less Allowance of	<u>28,267.38</u>
Balance of	56,392.90

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- Why did this Change Order take so much time before it came to the Board?

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO IMPLEMENT A QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM AT COUNTY PARKS

Senator Javier D. Souto

I. SUMMARY

This resolution if passed directs the County Manager to implement a quality control program in **ALL** Miami-Dade County Parks. The resolution requires a minimum: regular unscheduled inspections, education and training, periodic visits by Inspectors for Code Enforcement, Fire Safety, and ADA compliance, and the installation of suggestion boxes outside of restrooms.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

What level of service is being provided by the Department?

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

This Resolution will provide a higher level of service in County Parks.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Parks Department has determined the cost of **FULL** implementation of the requested quality control program at \$3,965,000. The Manager recommends phasing in the plan.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- What level of service is the Parks Department currently providing?
- Should the County continue building parks without having the capacity to properly maintain them?

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO REPLACE ALL CHAIN LINK FENCING AS ALLOWED BY THE BUDGET IN ALL MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PARKS WITH TWO-RAIL WOOD FENCING EXCEPT WHERE CHAIN LINK FENCING IS NECESSARY FOR OPERATIONAL OR STORAGE REASONS

Senator Javier D. Souto

I. SUMMARY

This resolution if passed directs the County Manager to replace **ALL** chain link fencing with two-rail wood fencing as allowed by budget and when not required for operation or storage in **ALL** Miami-Dade County Parks.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

The Parks and Recreation will have to perform a survey to determine the footage of chain link fencing that can be replaced.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

N/A

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Per the Parks Department, the cost for 4 ft. chain link fencing is approx. \$10.00 per linear foot. The cost for two-rail wood fencing ranges from approx. \$13.00 to \$17.00 per linear foot. The Parks Department is currently conducting an inventory and will report back to the Board by the end of October 2004.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- Does two-rail wood fencing have the same life as chain link?
- What are the maintenance costs of two-rail versus chain link?

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

*RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS WITH
COMPBENEFITS CORPORATION AND METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY TO OBTAIN EMPLOYEE GROUP DENTAL PROGRAMS, AND
AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF SAID AGREEMENTS FOR AND ON BEHALF
OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND THE EXERCISE OF ANY CANCELLATION AND
RENEWAL PROVISIONS AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONTAINED THEREIN
CONTRACT NOS. 421A, 421B AND 421C*

Procurement Management Department

I. SUMMARY

This authorizes award of RFP421A and 421B *Employee Group Dental Program (Prepaid Option 1 and Prepaid Option 2)* to CompBenefits Corporation (CompBenefits) and RFP421C *Employee Group Dental Program (Indemnity)* to Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife).

Contract amount estimate:	\$19 million total annually for the three programs
Funding source:	County pays employee premium, employee pays for enriched premium and dependents' premiums
Contract period:	3 years commencing January 1, 2005, with 2 one-year OTR at County's sole discretion
Measures:	None were applied

II. PRESENT SITUATION

At the July 20, 2004 GOE Committee, the Manager made the below award recommendations and request to waive Bid Protest procedures, which were rejected by the Committee:

- RFP421A (Prepaid Option 1) – CompBenefits
- RFP421B (Prepaid Option 2) – Private Medical Care, Inc. (PMI)
- RFP421C (Indemnity) – MetLife

Based on the final rankings, the highest ranked proposers were CompBenefits for Prepaid Option 1 and Prepaid Option 2. MetLife was the highest ranked for Indemnity. However, because CompBenefits would be very offering similar benefits under Option 1 and Option 2, the Manager recommended awarding Prepaid Option 2 to the next highest ranking firm, which was PMI. While PMI's plan design was similar to CompBenefit's OHS plan currently available to County employees, it had the lowest premiums. PMI's dental network was also smaller in size than CompBenefits, but it may have offered employees provider choices that may not be available to them under the CompBenefits plan. This recommendation was based on the intent to offer employees more dental plan choices, as both of CompBenefits plans (American Dental Plan and Oral Health Services, Prepaid Option 1 and Prepaid Option 2, respectively) were similar in terms of benefits and costs. There has been no bid protest to date.

September 21, 2004

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

The firms recommended for award are the incumbents currently providing dental plans to County employees.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

The cost estimate is \$19.0 million annually in total for all three contracts. The breakdown is as follows:

Prepaid Option 1 (ADP)	\$ 1.768 million
Prepaid Option 2 (OHS)	\$ 1.496 million
Indemnity (MetLife)	\$15.990 million

The proposed Prepaid Option 1 and Prepaid Option 2 rates were originally the same. The County negotiated a reduction in the Prepaid Option 2 rates of \$721,517 for the contract period, with an assumption of fewer members enrolled. (The annual negotiated rate for Option 2 is still \$103,257 higher than what had been proposed by PMI.)

The contract will be paid from the County's Internal Service Revenue Fund, a countywide Trust Fund which funds all costs associated with the RMD and the operations it is responsible for, including all workers' compensation costs, all liability costs, the costs of the benefits programs, as well as the administrative costs of running the division. Every County department pays into the fund.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

This item was on the Sept. 14, 2004 GOE Committee agenda. These replacement contracts would need to be awarded in September 2004 to allow the firms to participate in the annual employee open enrollment period which begins in mid-October.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT NO. 2 TO CONTRACT NO. 170 WITH MARSH USA INC., FOR THE OWNER CONTROLLED INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS CENTER, WAIVING THE PERIOD FOR BOARD RECONSIDERATION, AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR AND ON BEHALF OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY AND TO EXERCISE ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONTAINED THEREIN

Procurement Management Department

I. SUMMARY

This resolution will approve Supplemental Agreement No. 2 with Marsh USA Inc., for the Owner Controlled Insurance Program for the Performing Arts Center (PAC). The agreement provides for an increase of \$3,423,859 to the contract to extend coverage to October 14, 2005 with an additional not-to-exceed amount of \$1,000,000 to carry the program from October 15, 2005 to December 31, 2006.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

In January of 1999 the Board approved the award of Contract to Marsh USA, Inc. (formerly J&H Marsh & McLennan, Inc.) to provide broker services for the Owner Controlled Insurance Program (OCIP). The award was an amount not to exceed \$4,550,000 for the 39 month. The OCIP has done its job and the County expects a refund of \$448,725 because of the lower than expected loss experience.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

This will extend the OCIP through the end of construction at the PAC.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

The \$3,423,859 was anticipated and budgeted by the Manager in the additional \$67.7 million approved by the Board on July. The OCIP has already realized a savings of \$5,151,000.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

None

September 21, 2004

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH EAC CONSULTING, INC., FOR DESIGN PHASE SERVICES FOR THE BRIDGE OVER COLLINS CANAL FROM DADE BOULEVARD TO 23RD STREET AND PINE TREE DRIVE

Public Works Department

I. SUMMARY

This resolution seeks approval for an amendment (No. 1) to a Professional Services Agreement (PSA) between Miami-Dade County and EAC Consulting, Inc. for Engineering and Design Services associated with a bridge replacement project over the Collins Canal on Miami Beach.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

On September 15, 1998, the Board of County Commissioners approved this PSA for design work associated with the replacement of the 23rd Street Bridge over the Collins Canal in Miami Beach.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

Amendments to Professional Service Agreements are consistent with County Policy.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

This amendment would increase the amount paid to EAC Consulting by \$85,239 (approximately 50%) from \$171,429 to \$256,669.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Because some of the additions to the Scope of Work were requested by the City of Miami Beach (City), like decorative lighting, nonstandard barriers, and special railings, is the City going to reimburse the County for the additional costs associated with city requested changes?

September 21, 2004

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO.: 4-114: SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR THE PLATTING OF PROPERTY BY THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Public Works Department

I. SUMMARY

This resolution would allow the Miami-Dade Public Works Department (PWD) to amend Administrative Order 4-114 in order to create a new Fee Schedule for costs related to Road Closings.

The proposed fees would be equal to 10% of the per foot advalorem tax assessed land value of property adjacent to the right-of-way that is being closed.

These fees are designed to cover the costs to the County of reviewing and evaluating Road Closure Petitions.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

Currently applicants for a road closure pay a flat fee of \$750.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

This amendment would increase the application fee from \$750 to \$800, plus 10% of the assessed advalorem value of the land only for the adjacent properties (or a flat fee of \$1,200) whichever is greater.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

This amendment will have no negative fiscal impact to the County.

The applicant will be responsible for collecting the funds from any other adjacent property owners to submit with the Road Closure Petition and application.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

According to the PWD, the typical road closure has an average of 3 to four adjacent properties.

This fee may be waived by the Board of County Commissioners if it is deemed in the best interest of the public to do so.

BCC ITEM 7(P)(1)(D)

September 21, 2004

What happens when citizens on one side of the road are requesting the closure, but the residents on the other side are not?

For Example:

Various streets in Coral Gables, adjacent to Douglas Road have been closed. On one side of the closure are City of Coral Gables residents (West side of Closure) and on the other side of the closure is City of Miami Residents.

If the closure was requested by the Coral Gables residents but the City of Miami residents are still adjacent to the closure (East side of closure), are the City of Miami residents also assessed fees?

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION APPROVING CHANGE ORDER NO. FOUR AND FINAL TO THE CONTRACT WITH GENERAL ASPHALT COMPANY, INC., FOR QUALITY NEIGHBORHOODS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (QNIP) RESURFACING CONTRACT NO. 3 (MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT PROJECT NO. 630012Q)

Public Works Department

I. SUMMARY

This resolution is seeking approval for a Change Order (No. 4) and final to a resurfacing contract with **General Asphalt Co., Inc.** associated with the Quality Neighborhoods Improvement Program (QNIP) Contract No. 3.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

This contract was entered into in 1998 for road resurfacing projects associated with the Quality Neighborhood improvements Program.

Change Order No. 1 added 6 new pay items.

Change Order No. 2 added 7 new pay items.

Change Order No. 3 added 15 new pay items.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

This Change order would allow 8 new pay items to be covered through this contract.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

These new pay items will not result in any increase from the Original Contract Amount.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Including this Change Order, there will have been an additional 31 new pay items added to this contract.

How can 31 new items be added to the Scope of Work for a contract, and the contract amount not change?

Was the original contract amount over inflated?

Why aren't these additional projects re-bid?

BCC ITEM 7(P)(1)(E)
September 21, 2004

The original contract completion date associated with this project was July 31, 2001.

This completion date was extended 1 year to July 30, 2002 by the Director of the Public Works Department.

If this project was completed in 2002, why is the Board still dealing with associated Change Orders over 2 years later?

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION APPROVING CHANGE ORDER NO. FOUR AND FINAL TO THE CONTRACT WITH GENERAL ASPHALT COMPANY, INC., FOR QUALITY NEIGHBORHOODS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (QNIP) RESURFACING CONTRACT NO. 2 (MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT PROJECT NO. 630011 Q)

Public Works Department

I. SUMMARY

This resolution is seeking approval for a Change Order (No. 4) and final to a resurfacing contract with **General Asphalt Co., Inc.** associated with the Quality Neighborhoods Improvement Program (QNIP) Contract No. 2.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

This contract was entered into in 1998 for road resurfacing projects associated with the Quality Neighborhood improvements Program.

Change Order No. 1 added 12 new pay items.

Change Order No. 2 added 2 new pay items.

Change Order No. 3 added 5 new pay items.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

This Change order would allow 8 new pay items to be covered through this contract.

When change order requests similar to these occur, it brings into question whether the County's policy is to expedite the projects by utilizing open contracts, or should the policy be to re-bid these projects to involve other companies?

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

These new pay items will not result in any increase from the Original Contract Amount.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Including this Change Order, there will have been an additional 27 new pay items added to this contract.

How can 27 new items be added to the Scope of Work for a contract, and the contract amount not change?

BCC ITEM 7(P)(1)(F)
September 21, 2004

Was the original contract amount over inflated?

Why aren't these additional projects re-bid?

The original contract completion date associated with this project was September 17, 2001.

This completion date was extended 1 year to September 17, 2002 by the Director of the Public Works Department.

If this project was completed in 2002, why is the Board still dealing with associated Change Orders 2 years later?

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION DIRECTING COUNTY MANAGER TO AMEND THE MIAMI-DADE WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT'S RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER SERVICE TO PROVIDE A ONE TIME LIFETIME ADJUSTMENT WHEN THE CONSUMPTION RATE EXCEEDS BY SIX (6) TIMES THE AVERAGE QUARTERLY CONSUMPTION BASED ON THE PAST YEAR'S CONSUMPTION

Senator Javier D. Souto

I. SUMMARY

Item directs the County Manager to amend the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Departments rules and regulations to allow for a one time lifetime adjustment when the consumption rate exceeds by six (6) times the average quarterly water consumption.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

Currently, there is no mechanism readily available to the average consumer that allows residential customers to detect concealed leaks. Customers sometimes learn of the concealed leak when they review their quarterly water bill.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

Item would amend the Rules and Regulations for Water and Sewer department to provide for a 50% credit towards the customers' quarterly water bill and 100% credit towards the sewer bill in certain circumstances. This one time lifetime adjustment to quarterly bill customers is available to them in the event of a concealed or hidden leak when their bill exceeds by six (6) times the past year's average quarterly consumption.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Staff estimates the fiscal impact to the County would be \$355,000 per year.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- In order to qualify for the credit, the customer shall be required to make the necessary repairs and submit them as proof to the Water and Sewer Department.
- Currently, the Water and Sewer Department has a payment plan option for those customers that experience financial difficulties.
- Another way to detect irregular water consumption would be monthly (rather than quarterly) billing.
- Does the one time lifetime adjustment apply per residence or per customer?
- By time of printing, the supplement report for this item had not distributed.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION APPROVING ISSUANCE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$4,115,000 TO REFUND CERTAIN OUTSTANDING BONDS OF THE AUTHORITY ISSUED FOR BENEFIT OF SUSANNA WESLEY HEALTH CENTER, INC. FOR PURPOSES OF AND PURSUANT TO SECTION 159.47(1), FLORIDA STATUTES, AS AMENDED

Industrial Development Authority

I. SUMMARY

The Industrial Development Authority ("IDA") was created by resolution of Miami-Dade's Board of County Commissioners (the "Commissioners") in accordance with Florida Statutes Part III, Title XI, Chapter 159.44 to 159.53. The members of IDA are appointed by the Commissioners (per 159.45 (3)) to serve four-year terms. Before the Board are four resolutions authorizing the issuance of Industrial Development Revenue Bonds.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

N/A

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

The Board's approval of the issuance of Industrial Revenue Bonds will allow the applicants to receive Bond Financing without the County incurring any liability.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Item	Applicant	Bond Max.
9E1A	Susanna Wesley Health Center	\$4,115,000 ^a
9E1C	Covent of the Sacred Heart, Miami, Inc. d/b/a Carrollton School of the Sacred Heart	\$5,100,000
9E1B	RAM Investments of South Florida, Inc [SeaVee Boat]	\$3,650,000
9E1D	Waste Management, Inc	\$23,000,000 ^b

a – Revenue Refunding Bonds (No Public Hearing was required)

b – Increase to \$23,000,000 from previously approved \$21,000,000

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- As required by Federal Law, the Industrial Development Authority held a Public Hearing on August 25, 2004.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION URGING THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY AND MOTOR VEHICLES TO REQUIRE MOTORIZED SCOOTERS TO BE TITLED AND REGISTERED AND THEIR OPERATORS TO POSSESS A VALID DRIVER'S LICENSE AS MANDATED BY FLORIDA STATUTES

Commissioner Sally Heyman

Commissioner Dorrin D. Rolle

I. SUMMARY

This is a proposal to urge the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles to improve safety of motorized scooters by requiring the motorized scooters to be titled and registered and requiring their operators to have a valid driver's license.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

Florida Statutes are unclear on the status of motorized scooters. Motorized scooters are defined by Chapter 316, F.S. as "*any vehicle not having a seat or saddle for the use of the rider, designed to travel on not more than three wheels, and not capable of propelling the vehicle at a speed greater than 30 miles per hour on level ground.*" Motorized scooters are specifically exempted from the definition of "*motor vehicle*" under Chapter 316, F.S. but are not specifically mentioned (neither included nor excluded) under Chapters 320 and 322, F.S.

Currently, according to the Florida Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles (DHSMV), scooter with or without seats cannot be registered or even be driven by a licensed driver on a public road.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

- For 2002, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission's National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS) indicates an estimated 5,860 hospital emergency room visits occurred nationwide as a result of injuries from motorized scooter operations.
 - This is a 22% increase over the 4805 motorized scooter-related emergency room visits that the NEISS estimates to have occurred in 2001.
 - 1,853 of the motorized scooter-related emergency room visits in 2002 were reported to the NEISS as having occurred on streets or highways. (Note: It is probable that many additional injuries occurred on streets or highways without that information being reported to the NEISS because the injuries were not treated in an emergency room or because the data was not recorded.)

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

There is no direct impact to the County budget by this resolution, but adoption of the proposal by the State of Florida could result in lowering of health care costs for persons with and without health insurance.

There may however be indirect positive fiscal impacts, should State Law require registration and titles. These would be derived by any formula established to disburse any percentage of the registration fees back to the County where said vehicle is registered.

This however would have to be addressed statutorily.

The current standard fee returned to the County of origin from the State is \$2.50 per vehicle registered. Some Counties can also chose to add a .50 cent branch fee. Miami-Dade and Broward Counties assess the branch fee for a total return of \$3.00 per registration.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

An August 22, 2001 Consumer Product Safety Commission "*Consumer Alert*" on motorized scooter injuries and safety is appended as Attachment #1.

September 21, 2004

Attachment #1

Consumer Alert from CPSC

**Consumer Alert: Motorized Scooter Use Increases and Injuries Climb
CPSC recommends that riders wear proper safety gear**

August 21, WASHINGTON, D.C. - The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) today reported 2,250 emergency room-treated injuries associated with motorized scooters in the first 7 months of this year. If injuries continue at this rate, the total estimate for 2001 is expected to show a marked increase over 2000. The first full year in which CPSC collected data on these injuries was 1999. In 2000, there were an estimated 4,390 hospital emergency room treated injuries associated with motorized scooters. This represents more than a 200-percent increase over the 1999 estimate of 1,330 injuries.

CPSC is aware of at least three deaths associated with motorized scooters. Two of the deaths involved children, including a 6-year-old boy in California died after falling off a motorized scooter and an 11-year-old boy in Pennsylvania died when the motorized scooter he was riding crashed into a truck. Also, a 46-year-old man died in California after being struck by an automobile. All of the victims suffered head injuries; none was wearing a helmet.

CPSC recommends that riders wear the same safety gear as we recommend for non-powered scooters - a helmet, and knee and elbow pads. Sturdy shoes also are important. CPSC Chairman Ann Brown said, "Common sense requires that riders of all ages understand the importance of protective gear and observing local safety rules. Have fun outside but don't end up in the emergency room."

In 2000, an estimated 39 percent of the injuries occurred to children under 15 years of age. Most injuries occurred to the arms, legs, faces, and heads. The most common injuries were fractures.

Motorized scooters are increasing in popularity. They are two-wheel scooters, similar to the unpowered scooters, but equipped with either a small 2-cycle gasoline engine or an electric motor and a battery. Some manufacturers are retrofitting stocks of non-powered scooters with electric motors. In addition, kits are available to retrofit non-powered scooters. The gasoline-powered scooters usually cost between \$400 and \$1,300. The electric scooters range from under \$200 to about \$1,000.

Protective gear, including helmet and knee and elbow pads, is available for less than \$35.

CPSC recommends the following safety guidelines:

- Wear a helmet that meets CPSC's standard, along with knee and elbow pads.
- Wear sturdy shoes.
- Owners of motorized scooters should check with local authorities for riding guidelines and restrictions.
- Do not ride at night.
- Children under 12 should not ride motorized scooters.

To link from your web site to this press release on CPSC's web site, go to:
<http://www.cpsc.gov/cpscpub/prerel/prhtml01/01222.html>. The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission protects the public from unreasonable risks of injury or death from 15,000 types of consumer products under the agency's jurisdiction. To report a dangerous product or a product-related injury, call CPSC's hotline at (800) 638-2772 or CPSC's teletypewriter at (800) 638-8270, or visit CPSC's web site at <http://www.cpsc.gov/talk.html>. For information on CPSC's fax-on-demand service, call the above numbers or visit the web site at <http://cpsc.gov/about/who.html>.

BCC ITEM 10(A)(2)
September 21, 2004

Attachment #1

To order a press release through fax-on-demand, call (301) 504-0051 from the handset of your fax machine and enter the release number. Consumers can obtain this release and recall information at CPSC's web site at <http://www.cpsc.gov>.

News from CPSC
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
Office of Information and Public Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20207

For Immediate Release
August 22, 2001
Release # 01-222
Contact: Mark Ross (301) 504-0580 Ext. 1188

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE COUNTY MANAGER'S ACTION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE EXPEDITE ORDINANCE NO. 00-104, IN APPROVING ACTIVITIES LISTED ON THE ATTACHED SCHEDULES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

County Manager

I. SUMMARY

This resolution seeks to ratify the County Managers actions through Expedite Ordinance No. 00-104.

This ordinance allows for Capital Projects which have already been approved in the Annual Capital Budget to move forward without coming back to the Board of County Commissioners for a second "individual" approval.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

These projects have already been awarded via authority vested in the County Manager.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

Although the actual projects had been presented in the annual Capital Programs Budget, and thus approved by the Board of County Commissioners, the firms awarded these contracts do not appear as part of the Capital Budget.

The expedite ordinance places the responsibility of deciding which contractors are awarded these Capital projects with the County Manager and Department Heads.

However, if there are any concerns with a contractor (i.e. CSBE Compliance, Previous Contract Problems, etc...) then the specific item is brought to the BCC for approval.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

The total sum of the 102 projects listed in this ratification is approximately \$61,876,980.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Although the process has been started via the Expedite Ordinance of awarding these contracts, the contracts will not be fully exercised, nor are payments made, until ratification is approved by the BCC.